

Reply to Office Action dated February 8, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title and claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-12, 15-19, 22-25, 27, 29 and 34 are amended and claim 14 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action objects to the title. It is respectfully submitted that the new title is directed to the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 5-6, 8-9, 18-19, 22-23, 30 and 32-33 contain allowable subject matter. However, as will be described below, all claims are believed to contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,684,081 to Sarkkinen et al. (hereafter Sarkkinen). The Office Action also rejects claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12-17, 20-21, 24-29, 31 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarkkinen in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0035423 to Beckmann et al. (hereafter Beckmann). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites forming an SDU (Service Data Unit) without adding a header in a BMC (Broadcast/Multicast Control) layer, and transmitting the SDU to a terminal, the transmitted SDU including a list of a plurality of channels. Still further, independent claim 1 recites checking an input of a broadcast service key signal by a user and reading system information transmitted from a base station (Node B), calculating an IMSI (International Mobile

Reply to Office Action dated February 8, 2007

Subscriber Identity) value and selecting a corresponding channel from the list of the plurality of channels based on the calculating IMSI value. Still further, independent claim 1 recites reading a CTCH (Common Traffic Channel) indicator, configuring lower layers, and reading data received in the terminal, said reading a CTCH indicator being performed by an RRC (Radio Resource Control) of the terminal.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action states (on page 4) that Sarkkinen does not teach calculating an IMSI value, selecting a corresponding channel, reading a CTCH indicator, configuring lower levels and performing by a RRC of the terminal. The Office Action then cites Beckmann's paragraphs [0062], [0066] and [0076] as corresponding to the claimed calculating an IMSI value, selecting a corresponding channel and reading a CTCH indicator. However, the cited sections of Beckmann do not relate to calculating an IMSI value. Paragraph [0062] has no suggestion for an IMSI value and/or calculating an IMSI value. Still further, Beckmann does not teach or suggest selecting a corresponding channel from a list of a plurality of channels based on the calculated IMSI value. For at least these reasons, Sarkkinen and Beckmann do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 11 recites forming a service data unit by attaching a radio link control header to user data, and transmitting the service data unit to at least one terminal without attaching a header in a broadcast/multicast control layer. Independent claim 11 also recites

Reply to Office Action dated February 8, 2007

reading system information transmitted from a base station, calculating an international mobile subscriber identity value, and selecting a corresponding channel based on the calculated international mobile subscriber identity value.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Sarkkinen and Beckmann do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 11. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 25 recites forming a service data unit, transmitting said service data unit to a terminal, and checking an input of a broadcast service key signal of a user. Independent claim 25 further recites reading system information transmitted from a base station, calculating an international mobile subscriber identity value and selecting a corresponding channel based on the calculated international mobile subscriber identity value.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 25. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 11 and 25 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

Serial No. **10/713,273**

Docket No. **P-0598**

Reply to Office Action dated February 8, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: May 4, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610